

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 IN RE HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
12 SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE
13 LITIGATION

No. CV 12-06003 CRB

**ORDER UNSEALING COMPLAINT
IN PART AND REQUIRING
FURTHER BRIEFING**

14 This document relates to: ALL ACTIONS
15 _____/

16 Plaintiff moved to seal certain portions of the Consolidated Shareholder Derivative
17 Complaint, noting that Nominal Defendant Hewlett-Packard Company (“HP”) had
18 designated the material confidential, but that Plaintiff did not believe HP could justify sealing
19 all of the information. See dkt. 75. HP then moved to seal only some of what Plaintiff had
20 redacted. See dkt. 77. The Court granted HP’s motion. See dkt. 82. The Court UNSEALS
21 all redacted information in the Complaint except the portions identified in its Order of May
22 20, 2013, see dkt. 82, as no party has offered any reason why it should remain sealed.

23 Upon further review, the Court ORDERS HP to explain and provide relevant authority
24 addressing, in a filing of no more than six pages delivered to the Court on or before 5:00 p.m.
25 on May 23, 2013, how releasing the kind of information that remains sealed “would harm
26 Autonomy’s competitive position . . . [in] that Autonomy’s competitors would be interested
27 in and could make competitive use of HP’s internal assessments and internal financial
28 metrics for the Autonomy business,” Pforzheimer Decl. (dkt. 77-2) ¶¶ 3-4, and why that
interest (or another interest) amounts to a “compelling reason” overcoming the “strong

1 presumption in favor of access to court records.” Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins., 331
2 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003).

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4
5 Dated: May 20, 2013

6 
7 CHARLES R. BREYER
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California